

January 29, 2025

FILED

~~By EMAIL: cwpa@uscourts.gov~~

FEB 03 2025

CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

The Honorable Claudia Wilken, United States Senior District Judge
Northern District of California
Ronald V. Dellums Federal Building & United States Courthouse
c/o Class Action Clerk
1301 Clay Street
Oakland, CA 94612

RE: Proposed Roster Limits (House v. NCAA, Case No. 4:20-cv-03919-CW)

Honorable Judge Claudia Wilken:

I am the parent of a UCLA athlete writing this letter of objection on behalf of my child and all college athletes and families who are affected by the proposed roster limits in House v. NCAA, Case No. 4:20-cv-03919-CW. I am writing anonymously out of fear of retaliation and to protect my child's privacy.

As others have pointed out, the roster limits imagined in the settlement would allow schools to renege on the promises they made when awarding four-year scholarships to athletes they recruited (specifically that these awards were not conditioned on athletic performance and could only be pulled for academic or disciplinary reasons). This is clearly unacceptable. But I also wanted to make you aware that, for UCLA athletes specifically, the proposed roster cuts could result in even more dire consequences. That's because, at UCLA, any athlete who stops playing their sport before junior year has their admission rescinded and is automatically expelled.

(Hard to believe, I know. But, true).

In response to the Varsity Blues scandal, quietly, during Covid, UCLA's Faculty Senate voted to impose a two-year minimum participation requirement on all athletes — including non-scholarship athletes — in an effort to slam the "Athlete Admissions Side Door" shut. UCLA's "minimum participation" policy means that every athlete's admission to UCLA is conditioned on their completing six quarters, or two years, as an *active participant* on their team. The only way a UCLA athlete can stop playing their sport before junior year and still pursue an undergraduate degree at UCLA is to go before a committee and ask them to waive the requirement because of a well-documented medical or mental health condition.

To be clear - even an athlete who, by virtue of their high school record, would have likely been admitted to UCLA -- even a student athlete who maintains a 4.0 GPA at UCLA -- and even a student athlete who would prefer to remain on their team if they weren't being run off by their coach -- automatically gets expelled from UCLA if they stop playing their sport before the midpoint of their college career. This has been the case since the Fall of 2021.

I have seen no indication that the UCLA's Faculty-Senate intends to rescind this policy in light of the proposed roster limits, despite the fact that many more athletes than usual could be impacted by it starting next year. Current freshman -- athletes admitted to the class of 2028 -- who are cut due to the proposed roster limits at the end of this school year and unable to participate during their sophomore season, are especially at risk.

I am sure the court did not anticipate that, by approving this settlement, they'd be dealing a death blow not just to the college sports careers but also to the **academic futures** of some UCLA athletes. But this would indeed be the effect of your actions.

There are, in my opinion, many reasons why UCLA's minimum participation policy should be revoked: it relegates athletes to a subclass of "provisional" students for the first two years at UCLA and forces them to pay the price for the university's past admissions failures; it does not

Case 4:20-cv-03919-CW Document 658 Filed 02/03/25 Page 2 of 3

consider the individual but assume that certain students are less qualified to be members of the student body by virtue of the fact that they excel at a sport; it is, in my view, inherently racist, given that the majority of other "special talent" admits – for theater, film and art – who are predominantly white, are not subjected to a participation requirement and; because it places additional restraints on athletes and not other students admitted under a "special talents" application process, it violates the Big Ten conference's rules, which require members to provide athletes with the same rights and opportunities as other students.

However, unless or until UCLA's athlete admissions policy is revised, the roster limits proposed by the House settlement will cause serious and irreparable harm to students admitted to UCLA as athletes.

Thank you for considering this objection.

Sincerely,
A Concerned Bruin Parent

Relevant links:

You will find this on page 57 and 58 of the UCLA Academic Senate's **Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Undergraduate Admission Procedures (March 2021)** Here is the link to the document. <https://dms.senate.ucla.edu/issues/document/?11518.AdHoc.Admission.Committee.Report.FINAL>

Here's the link. <https://dms.senate.ucla.edu/issues/document/?11518.AdHoc.Admission.Committee.Report.FINAL>

This is from UCLA's **Systemwide Audit of Undergraduate Admissions Audit #19-714007** which I have attached. On page 13, screenshot here, they discuss imposing a two year minimum requirement.

In this audit report, the auditors suggest implementing a one year minimum participation requirement for athletes across all the UC campuses. (UCLA already had one in place so they extended it to two years ---- without fully considering the consequences of the change).

<https://regents.universityofcalifornia.edu/regmeet/mar20/c2attach1.pdf>

Here is the state auditor's report from September 2020
<https://information.auditor.ca.gov/reports/2019-113/sections.html#section1>

Article from the school newspaper. <https://dailybruin.com/2020/03/05/uc-needs-stronger-unified-accountability-regarding-student-athlete-admissions>



29 JAN 2025 PM 3 L

The Honorable Claudia Wilken
US Senior District Judge
Northern District of CA
Ronald J. Bellunis Federal
Class Action Clerk

1301 Clay St
Oakland, CA 94612

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO